arXiv:1105.1416v1 [math.FA] 7 May 2011

COMPOSITION OPERATORS ON THE BERGMAN SPACES OF A MINIMAL BOUNDED HOMOGENEOUS DOMAIN

SATOSHI YAMAJI

Abstract. Using an integral formula on a homogeneous Siegel domain, we show a necessary and sufficient condition for composition operators on the weighted Bergman space of a minimal bounded homogeneous domain to be compact. To describe the compactness of composition operators, we see a boundary behavior of the Bergman kernel.

1. Introduction

In 2007, Zhu [14] considered the composition operators on the weighted Bergman space of the unit ball. His results are extended to the case that the domain is the Harish-Chandra realization of irreducible bounded symmetric domain by Lu and Hu [8]. In this paper, we consider a generalization of their works for the weighted Bergman space of a minimal bounded homogeneous domain (for the definition of the mininal domain, see [7], [9]). Indeed, the unit ball, the polydisk and a bounded symmetric domain in its Harish-Chandra realization are minimal domains.

Let $\mathcal{U}$ be a minimal bounded homogeneous domain in $\mathbb{C}^d$, $dV(z)$ the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{C}^d$ and $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{U})$ the space of all holomorphic functions on $\mathcal{U}$. The Bergman kernel $K_{\mathcal{U}} : \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is the reproducing kernel of the Bergman space $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV) := L^2(\mathcal{U}, dV) \cap \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{U})$. The Bergman kernel is a useful tool to study properties of composition operators, Toeplitz operators and Hankel operators on the Bergman space (for example, see [12]). In this paper, we see that a necessary and sufficient condition for a bounded composition operator to be compact is described by a boundary behavior of the Bergman kernel.

For $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, let dV_β denote the measure on $\mathcal{U}$ given by $dV_\beta(z) := K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{-\beta} dV(z)$. We consider the weighted Bergman space $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta) := L^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta) \cap \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{U})$. It is known that there exists a constant $\beta_{\min}$ such that $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ is non-trivial if and only if $\beta > \beta_{\min}$ (for explicit expression of $\beta_{\min}$, see section 5.1). From now on, we consider non-trivial weighted Bergman spaces. For a holomorphic map φ from $\mathcal{U}$ to $\mathcal{U}$, the composition operator C_φ is a linear operator on $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{U})$ defined by $C_\varphi f := f \circ \varphi$. We conside the composition operator on the weighted Bergman space $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$. Using Zhu's technique (see [14]) together with an integral formula (see Lemma 5.2), we obtain the following theorem, which is the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem A (Theorem 6.1). *Assume that* C_φ *is bounded on* $L^q_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$ *for some* $q > 0$ *and* $\beta_0 > \beta_{\min}$. *Then* C_φ *is compact on* $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ *for any* $p > 0$ *and* $\beta > \beta_0 + \beta_{\text{int}}$ *if and*

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 47B33; Secondary 47B35, 32A25.

Key words and phrases. composition operator, Bergman space, bounded homogeneous domain, minimal domain, Carleson measure.

only if

$$\lim_{z \to \partial \mathcal{U}} \frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}\left(\varphi(z), \varphi(z)\right)}{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z, z)} = 0.$$

Since the unit ball and the Harish-Chandra realization of irreducible bounded symmetric domain are minimal domains, Theorem A is a generalization of [14, Theorem 4.1] and [8, Theorem] (see section 7). Similarly to the case of them, the assumption that C_φ is a bounded operator on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$ for some $\beta_0 > \beta_{\min}$ is needed only for the "if" part of Theorem A.

To prove Theorem A for the case that $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{B}^d$, Zhu used Schur's theorem. To apply Zhu's method, it is important to find a positive function satisfying a certain inequality. Zhu found this function by using Forelli-Rudin inequality (see [14, Lemma 2.6]). Instead, we find the function by using Lemma 5.2. By [10], there exists a biholomorphic map Φ from the bounded homogeneous domain $\mathcal{U}$ onto a homogeneous Siegel domain $\mathcal{D}$. In Lemma 5.2, we shall consider the integral

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} \left|K_{\mathcal{U}}(z, z')\right|^{1+\alpha} \left|\det J(\Phi, z')\right|^{1+2\beta-\alpha} \, dV_\beta(z'),$$

where $J(\Phi, z')$ denotes the complex Jacobi matrix of Φ at z'. The integral converges if and only if $\beta > \beta_{\min}$ and $\alpha > \beta + \beta_{\mathrm{int}}$, where β_{int} is a constant defined from $\mathcal{U}$ (see section 5.1).

Before the proof of theorem A, we show that the boundedness of C_φ on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ is described in terms of Carleson measures. It is easy to see that C_φ is a bounded operator on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ if and only if the pull-back measure $d\mu_{\varphi,\beta}$ of dV_β induced by φ is a Carleson measure for $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ (see section 4.1). Using properties of Carleson measures, we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem B (Theorems 4.3 and 4.5). *If C_φ is a bounded (resp. compact) operator on $L^q_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$ for some $q > 0$ and $\beta_0 > \beta_{\min}$, then C_φ is a bounded (resp. compact) operator on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ for any $p > 0$ and $\beta \geq \beta_0$.*

By Theorem B, the assumption of Theorem A implies that C_φ is bounded on $L^q_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$ for any $q > 0$ and $\beta \geq \beta_0$. We use the boundedness of C_φ on $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ and $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$ in section 6.2.

Let us explain the organization of this paper. In section 2, we review properties of the weighted Bergman space of a minimal bounded homogeneous domain and composition operators on the space. Theorem 2.1 plays an important role in this section. In section 3, we show some properties of Carleson measures and vanishing Carleson measures for the weighted Bergman space of a minimal bounded homogeneous domain (Theorems 3.2 and 3.3). Using them, we prove properties of the boundedness and compactness of C_φ in section 4 (Theorems 4.3 and 4.5). In section 5, we show an important equality (Lemma 5.2). By using Lemma 5.2, we prove the characterization of the compactness of the composition operator (Theorem A) in section 6. In section 7, we apply Theorem A for the case that $\mathcal{U}$ is the unit ball, bounded symmetric domain in its Harish-Chandra realization, the polydisk and the representative domain of the tube domain over Vinberg cone, which is an example of nonsymmetric bounded homogeneous domain. These domains are minimal domains with a center 0.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Weighted Bergman spaces of a minimal bounded homogeneous domain.** Let D be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{C}^d$. We say that D is a minimal domain with a center $t \in D$ if the following condition is satisfied: for every biholomorphism $\psi : D \longrightarrow D'$ with $\det J(\psi, t) = 1$, we have

$$\mathrm{Vol}(D') \geq \mathrm{Vol}(D).$$

We see that D is a minimal domain with a center t if and only if

$$K_D(z,t) = \frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}(D)}$$

for any $z \in D$ (see [6, Proposition 3.6] or [9, Theorem 3.1]). For example, the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$ and the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^d$ are minimal domains with a center 0.

We fix a minimal bounded homogeneous domain $\mathcal{U}$ with a center t. We denote by $K_{\mathcal{U}}^{(\beta)}$ the reproducing kernel of $L_a^2(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$. It is known that $K_{\mathcal{U}}^{(\beta)}(z,w) = C_\beta K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,w)^{1+\beta}$ for some positive constant C_β. For $z \in \mathcal{U}$, we denote by $k_z^{(\beta)}$ the normalized reproducing kernel of $L_a^2(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$, that is,

$$k_z^{(\beta)}(w) := \frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}^{(\beta)}(w,z)}{K_{\mathcal{U}}^{(\beta)}(z,z)^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \sqrt{C_\beta}\left(\frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,z)}{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)^{1+\beta}. \tag{2.1}$$

For any Borel set E in $\mathcal{U}$, we define

$$\mathrm{Vol}_\beta(E) := \int_E dV_\beta(w).$$

Let $d_{\mathcal{U}}(\cdot,\cdot)$ be the Bergman distance on $\mathcal{U}$. For any $z \in \mathcal{U}$ and $r > 0$, let

$$B(z,r) := \{w \in \mathcal{U} \mid d_{\mathcal{U}}(z,w) \leq r\}$$

be the Bergman metric disk with center z and radius r.

In [7], we proved the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1 ([7, Theorem A])**.** *For any $\rho > 0$, there exists $C_\rho > 0$ such that*

$$C_\rho^{-1} \leq \left|\frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,a)}{K_{\mathcal{U}}(a,a)}\right| \leq C_\rho$$

for all $z, a \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $d_{\mathcal{U}}(z,a) \leq \rho$.

From Theorem 2.1, we obtain that $K_{\mathcal{U}}(\cdot, a)$ is a bounded function on $\mathcal{U}$ for each $a \in \mathcal{U}$ (see [7, Proposition 6.1]). Since $\mathrm{span}\langle K_{\mathcal{U}}^{(\beta)}(\cdot,a)\rangle$ is dense in $L_a^2(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$, we see that $H^\infty(\mathcal{U})$ is dense in $L_a^2(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$, where $H^\infty(\mathcal{U})$ is the set of all bounded holomorphic functions on $\mathcal{U}$.

Moreover, we obtain useful lemmas from Theorem 2.1. First, we deduce

$$C_\rho^{-2} \leq \frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)}{K_{\mathcal{U}}(a,a)} \leq C_\rho^2 \tag{2.2}$$

for all $z, a \in \mathcal{U}$ such that $d_{\mathcal{U}}(z,a) \leq \rho$. On the other hand, we have

$$C^{-1} K_{\mathcal{U}}(a,a)^{-1} \leq \left|\frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,a)}{K_{\mathcal{U}}(a,a)}\right|^2 \mathrm{Vol}\left(B(a,\rho)\right) \leq C K_{\mathcal{U}}(a,a)^{-1}.$$

by [11, Lemma 3.3]. Therefore, we have

$$C^{-1}K_{\mathcal{U}}(a,a)^{-1} \leq \mathrm{Vol}\,(B(a,\rho)) \leq CK_{\mathcal{U}}(a,a)^{-1} \tag{2.3}$$

by Theorem 2.1. Therefore, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.2. *There exists a positive constant C such that*

$$C^{-1}K_{\mathcal{U}}(a,a)^{-(1+\beta)} \leq \mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(a,\rho)) \leq CK_{\mathcal{U}}(a,a)^{-(1+\beta)} \tag{2.4}$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{U}$.

Proof. Since

$$\mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(a,\rho)) = \int_{B(a,\rho)} K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,w)^{-\beta} dV(w),$$

we have

$$C^{-1}K_{\mathcal{U}}(a,a)^{-\beta}\mathrm{Vol}\,(B(a,\rho)) \leq \mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(a,\rho)) \leq CK_{\mathcal{U}}(a,a)^{-\beta}\mathrm{Vol}\,(B(a,\rho))\,. \tag{2.5}$$

by (2.2). We obtain (2.4) from (2.3) and (2.5). □

By (2.1), Lemma 2.2 and Theorem 2.1, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3 (cf. [12, Lemma 1])**.** *There exists a positive constant C such that*

$$C^{-1} \leq \left|k_a^{(\beta)}(z)\right|^2 \mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(a,\rho)) \leq C$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{U}$ and $z \in B(a,\rho)$.

Lemma 2.2 and (2.3) yield the following;

Lemma 2.4 (cf. [12, Lemma 2])**.** *There exists a positive constant C such that*

$$C^{-1}\mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(a,\rho)) \leq \mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(z,\rho)) \leq C\mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(a,\rho))$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{U}$ and $z \in B(a,\rho)$.

We have the following estimate.

Lemma 2.5 (cf. [12, Lemma 5])**.** *There exists a positive constant C such that*

$$|f(z)|^p \leq \frac{C}{\mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(z,\rho))} \int_{B(z,\rho)} |f(w)|^p \; dV_\beta(w) \tag{2.6}$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{U}), p > 0$ and $z \in \mathcal{U}$.

Proof. By [11, Lemma 3.5], there exists a $C > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} |f(z)|^p &\leq \frac{C}{\mathrm{Vol}\,(B(z,\rho))} \int_{B(z,\rho)} |f(w)|^p \; dV(w) \\ &\leq \frac{CK_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^\beta}{\mathrm{Vol}\,(B(z,\rho))} \int_{B(z,\rho)} |f(w)|^p \; dV_\beta(w), \end{aligned}$$

where the lat inequality follows from (2.2). By (2.5), we have

$$\frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^\beta}{\mathrm{Vol}\,(B(z,\rho))} \leq \frac{C}{\mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(z,\rho))}.$$

Hence, we obtain (2.6). □

2.2. **Composition operator.**

In this section, we summarize properties of the composition operator (see also [13, section 11], [14]). Let φ be a holomorphic map from $\mathcal{U}$ to $\mathcal{U}$. For $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{U})$, we define $C_\varphi f := f \circ \varphi$. Then, C_φ is a linear operator on $\mathcal{O}(\mathcal{U})$. The operator C_φ is called the composition operator induced by φ. It is known that C_φ is always bounded on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ for the case that $\mathcal{U}$ is the unit disk $\mathbb{D}$. However, for a general minimal bounded homogeneous domain $\mathcal{U}$, a composition operator is not necessarily bounded on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ (for example, see [14]).

On the other hand, for any Borel set E in $\mathcal{U}$, we define

$$\mu_{\varphi,\beta}(E) := \mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(\varphi^{-1}(E)).$$

The measure $\mu_{\varphi,\beta}$ is called the pull-back measure of dV_β induced by φ. Then, C_φ is a bounded operator on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ if and only if there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} |f(w)|^p \, d\mu_{\varphi,\beta}(w) \le C \int_{\mathcal{U}} |f(w)|^p \, dV_\beta(w) \tag{2.7}$$

holds for any $f \in L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$.

Assume that C_φ is a bounded operator on $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$. Then, we have

$$C^*_\varphi f(w) = \langle C^*_\varphi f, K^{(\beta)}_w \rangle_{L^2(dV_\beta)} = \left\langle f, C_\varphi K^{(\beta)}_w \right\rangle_{L^2(dV_\beta)} \tag{2.8}$$

for any $f \in L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$. Therefore, we have

$$C_\varphi C^*_\varphi f(w) = \langle f, C_\varphi K^{(\beta)}_{\varphi(w)} \rangle_{L^2(dV_\beta)} = \int_{\mathcal{U}} K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(w), \varphi(u)) f(u) \, dV_\beta(u). \tag{2.9}$$

We use (2.9) to characterize the compactness of C_φ. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} C^*_\varphi C_\varphi f(w) &= \left\langle C_\varphi f, C_\varphi K^{(\beta)}_w \right\rangle_{L^2(dV_\beta)} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{U}} f(\varphi(u)) K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(w, \varphi(u)) \, dV_\beta(u) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{U}} K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(w, u) f(u) \, d\mu_{\varphi,\beta}(u) \end{aligned}$$

by (2.8). Therefore, we obtain $C^*_\varphi C_\varphi = T_{\mu_{\varphi,\beta}}$, where $T_{\mu_{\varphi,\beta}}$ is the Toeplitz operator with symbol $\mu_{\varphi,\beta}$. The boundedness of Toeplitz operators are discussed in [11], [13, section 7] and [14].

3. CARLESON MEASURES AND VANISHING CARLESON MEASURES

3.1. **Berezin symbol and averaging function.**

For a Borel measure μ on $\mathcal{U}$, we define a function $\widetilde{\mu}$ on $\mathcal{U}$ by

$$\widetilde{\mu}(z) := \int_{\mathcal{U}} |k^{(\beta)}_z(w)|^2 \, d\mu(w),$$

which is called the Berezin symbol of the measure μ. For fixed $\rho > 0$, we define a function $\widehat{\mu}$ on $\mathcal{U}$ by

$$\widehat{\mu}(z) := \frac{\mu(B(z, \rho))}{\mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(z, \rho))},$$

which is called the averaging function of the Borel measure μ. Although the value of $\widehat{\mu}$ depends on the parameter ρ, we will ignore that distinction.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a positive constant* C *such that*

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} |f(z)|^p \, d\mu(z) \leq C \int_{\mathcal{U}} \widehat{\mu}(z) \, |f(z)|^p \, dV_\beta(z)$$

for any $p > 0$ *and* $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{U})$.

Proof. By Lemma 2.5, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} |f(z)|^p \, d\mu(z) \leq C \int_{\mathcal{U}} \left(\frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(z,\rho))} \int_{B(z,\rho)} |f(w)|^p \, dV_\beta(w) \right) d\mu(z) \tag{3.1}$$

for any $p > 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{U})$. The right hand side of (3.1) is equal to

$$C \int_{\mathcal{U}} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \frac{\chi_{B(z,\rho)}(w)}{\mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(z,\rho))} \, |f(w)|^p \, dV_\beta(w) d\mu(z). \tag{3.2}$$

By using Fubini's theorem, (3.2) is equal to

$$C \int_{\mathcal{U}} \left(\int_{B(w,\rho)} \frac{1}{\mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(z,\rho))} \, d\mu(z) \right) |f(w)|^p \, dV_\beta(w). \tag{3.3}$$

By Lemma 2.4, (3.3) is less than or equal to

$$C \int_{\mathcal{U}} \frac{\mu(B(w,\rho))}{\mathrm{Vol}_\beta\,(B(w,\rho))} \, |f(w)|^p \, dV_\beta(w).$$

□

3.2. **Carleson measures.** Let μ be a positive Borel measure on $\mathcal{U}$ and $p > 0$. We say that μ is a Carleson measure for $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ if there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} |f(z)|^p \, d\mu(z) \leq M \int_{\mathcal{U}} |f(z)|^p \, dV_\beta(z)$$

for all $f \in L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$. It is easy to see that μ is a Carleson measure for $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ if and only if $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta) \subset L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, d\mu)$ and the inclusion map

$$i_p : L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta) \longrightarrow L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, d\mu)$$

is bounded.

The following theorem is a generalization of [12, Theorem 7] to a minimal bounded homogeneous domain.

Theorem 3.2. *Let* μ *be a positive Borel measure on* $\mathcal{U}$. *Then, the following conditions are all equivalent.*
(i) μ *is a Carleson measure for* $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$.
(ii) $\widetilde{\mu}$ *is a bounded function on* $\mathcal{U}$.
(iii) $\widehat{\mu}$ *is a bounded function on* $\mathcal{U}$.

Proof. First, we prove $(i) \implies (ii)$. Since $k^{(\beta)}_z(w)^{\frac{2}{p}} \in L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ and μ is a Carleson measure for $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} |k^{(\beta)}_z(w)|^2 \, d\mu(w) \leq M \int_{\mathcal{U}} \left| k^{(\beta)}_z(w) \right|^2 dV_\beta(w) = M.$$

Therefore, $\widetilde{\mu}$ is bounded. Next, we prove $(ii) \Longrightarrow (iii)$. Take any $w \in \mathcal{U}$. By Lemma 2.3, there exists a positive constant C such that

$$C \leq \left|k_z^{(\beta)}(w)\right|^2 \operatorname{Vol}_\beta\left(B(w,\rho)\right) \tag{3.4}$$

holds for any $w \in B(z,\rho)$. We integrate (3.4) on $B(z,\rho)$ by $d\mu$. Then, we have

$$\frac{\mu(B(z,\rho))}{\operatorname{Vol}_\beta\left(B(z,\rho)\right)} \leq C \int_{B(a,\rho)} \left|k_a^{(\beta)}(z)\right|^2 \, d\mu(z). \tag{3.5}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\widehat{\mu}(z) \leq C\widetilde{\mu}(z). \tag{3.6}$$

Hence, $(ii) \Longrightarrow (iii)$ holds. The part $(iii) \Longrightarrow (i)$ follows from Lemma 3.1. □

Similarly to [11, Theorem 4.1], we can prove that these conditions are equivalent to the following condition: (iv) The Toeplitz operator T_μ is bounded on $L_a^2(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$.

3.3. **Vanishing Carleson measure.**

Suppose that μ is a Carleson measure for $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$. We say that μ is a vanishing Carleson measure for $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ if

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathcal{U}} |f_k(w)|^p \, d\mu(w) = 0$$

whenever $\{f_k\}$ is a bounded sequence in $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ that converges to 0 uniformly on each compact subset of $\mathcal{U}$.

The following theorem is a generalization of [12, Theorem 11] to a minimal bounded homogeneous domain.

Theorem 3.3. *Let μ be a finite positive Borel measure on $\mathcal{U}$. Then, the following conditions are all equivalent.*
(i) μ is a vanishing Carleson measure for $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$.
(ii) $\widetilde{\mu}(z) \to 0$ as $z \to \partial\mathcal{U}$.
(iii) $\widehat{\mu}(z) \to 0$ as $z \to \partial\mathcal{U}$.

Proof. First, we prove $(i) \Longrightarrow (ii)$. In the same way as in [4, Lemma 1] and [4, Lemma 5], we can see that $\{k_z^{(\beta)}\}$ converges to 0 uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathcal{U}$ as $z \to \partial\mathcal{U}$. Therefore, $\{k_z^{(\beta)}(w)^{\frac{2}{p}}\}$ is a bounded sequence in $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ that converges to 0 uniformly on each compact subset of $\mathcal{U}$. Hence, (ii) holds. The part $(ii) \Longrightarrow (iii)$ follows from (3.6). Finally, we prove $(iii) \Longrightarrow (i)$. Take any bounded sequence $\{f_n\}$ in $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ that converges to 0 uniformly on each compact subset of $\mathcal{U}$. Take any $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\operatorname{dist}(z,\partial\mathcal{U})<\delta} |\widehat{\mu}(z)| < \varepsilon$$

by (iii). Let $\mathcal{U}_\delta := \{z \in \mathcal{U} \mid \operatorname{dist}(z, \partial\mathcal{U}) < \delta\}$. Since $\mathcal{U}\backslash\mathcal{U}_\delta$ is a compact set, there exists an integer N such that

$$\sup_{z\in\mathcal{U}\backslash\mathcal{U}_\delta} |f_n(z)|^p < \varepsilon$$

for any $n \geq N$. Here, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{U}} |f_n(z)|^p \, d\mu(z) &\leq C \int_{\mathcal{U}} \widehat{\mu}(z) \, |f_n(z)|^p \, dV_\beta(z) \\ &= C \left(\int_{\mathcal{U} \setminus \mathcal{U}_\delta} \widehat{\mu}(z) \, |f_n(z)|^p \, dV_\beta(z) + \int_{\mathcal{U}_\delta} \widehat{\mu}(z) \, |f_n(z)|^p \, dV_\beta(z) \right) \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

by Lemma 3.1. Since $\widehat{\mu}(z)$ is a continuous function on $\mathcal{U} \setminus \mathcal{U}_\delta$ and $\mathcal{U} \setminus \mathcal{U}_\delta$ is a compact set, there exists a constant $M_\delta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \mathcal{U}_\delta} \widehat{\mu}(z) \leq M_\delta.$$

Therefore, the first term of (3.7) is less than or equal to $CM_\delta \varepsilon$ if $n \geq N$. On the other hand, since $\{f_n\}$ is a bounded sequence in $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} |f_n(z)|^p \, dV_\beta(z) \leq M$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, the second term of (3.7) is less than or equal to $CM\varepsilon$. Hence, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} |f_n(z)|^p \, d\mu(z) \leq C(M + M_\delta)\varepsilon$$

for any $n \geq N$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \int_{\mathcal{U}} |f_n(z)|^p \, d\mu(z) = 0.$$

Hence, $(iii) \Longrightarrow (i)$ holds. □

We can show that these conditions are also equivalent to the following condition (cf. [11, Theorem 5.1]): (iv) The Toeplitz operator T_μ is compact on $L_a^2(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$.

4. Relation between Carleson measures and composition operators

4.1. Criterion of boundedness. From (2.7), we see that C_φ is a bounded operator on $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ if and only if the pull-back measure $\mu_{\varphi,\beta}$ is a Carleson measure for $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$. By Theorem 3.2, the property of being a Carleson measure is independent of p. Hence, the boundedness of C_φ on $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ is also independent of p. We summarize the characterization of the boundedness of C_φ on $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ as follows.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\beta > \beta_{\min}$. Then, the following conditions are all equivalent.*
(i) C_φ is a bounded operator on $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$.
(ii) The pull-back measure $\mu_{\varphi,\beta}$ is a Carleson measure for $L_a^p(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$.
(iii) $\widetilde{\mu_{\varphi,\beta}}$ is a bounded function on $\mathcal{U}$.
(iv) $\widehat{\mu_{\varphi,\beta}}$ is a bounded function on $\mathcal{U}$.
(v) The function

$$F_{\rho,\beta}(z) := \int_{B(z,\rho)} \left| k_z^{(\beta)}(w) \right|^2 \, d\mu_{\varphi,\beta}(w)$$

is bounded on $\mathcal{U}$.

Proof. The equivaliance of (i) – (iv) follows from Theorem 3.2. Moreover, $(iii) \Longrightarrow (v)$ is trivial and $(v) \Longrightarrow (iv)$ follows from (3.5). $\square$

If C_φ is bounded, we have the following estimate.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that C_φ is bounded on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ for some $p > 0$ and $\beta > \beta_0$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$K_{\mathcal{U}}\left(\varphi(z), \varphi(z)\right) \leq C K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)$$

for any $z \in \mathcal{U}$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.1, it is enough to consider $p = 2$. By (2.8), we have

$$\begin{aligned} C^*_\varphi k^{(\beta)}_z(w) &= \left\langle k^{(\beta)}_z, C_\varphi K^{(\beta)}_w \right\rangle_{L^2(dV_\beta)} = K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \, \overline{\left\langle C_\varphi K^{(\beta)}_w, K^{(\beta)}_z \right\rangle}_{L^2(dV_\beta)} \\ &= K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \, \overline{C_\varphi K^{(\beta)}_w(z)} = \frac{K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(w, \varphi(z))}{K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left\| C^*_\varphi k^{(\beta)}_z \right\|^2_{L^2(dV_\beta)} = \frac{K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}\left(\varphi(z), \varphi(z)\right)}{K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)} = \left(\frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(z), \varphi(z))}{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)} \right)^{1+\beta}. \tag{4.1}$$

Since C_φ is a bounded operator on $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ and $\|k^{(\beta)}_z\|_{L^2(dV_\beta)} = 1$, the left hand side of (4.1) is less than or equal to a positive constant C. $\square$

Theorem 4.3. *If C_φ is a bounded operator on $L^q_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$ for some $q > 0$ and $\beta_0 > \beta_{\min}$, then C_φ is a bounded operator on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ for any $p > 0$ and $\beta \geq \beta_0$.*

Proof. The boundedness of C_φ on $L^q_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$ (resp. $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$) is equivalent to the boundedness of $\widetilde{\mu_{\varphi,\beta_0}}$ and F_{ρ,β_0} (resp. $\widetilde{\mu_{\varphi,\beta}}$ and $F_{\rho,\beta}$) by Lemma 4.1. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove

$$\widetilde{\mu_{\varphi,\beta_0}}(z) \geq C F_{\rho,\beta}(z). \tag{4.2}$$

Since

$$K_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(w), \varphi(w)) \leq C K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,w)$$

by Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} dV_{\beta_0}(w) &= K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,w)^{\beta-\beta_0} \, dV_\beta(w) \\ &\geq C K_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(w), \varphi(w))^{\beta-\beta_0} \, dV_\beta(w). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{\mu_{\varphi,\beta_0}}(z) \\ &= K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{-(1+\beta_0)} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \left| K_{\mathcal{U}}(z, \varphi(w)) \right|^{2(1+\beta_0)} \, dV_{\beta_0}(w) \\ &\geq C K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{-(1+\beta_0)} \int_{\mathcal{U}} \left| K_{\mathcal{U}}(z, \varphi(w)) \right|^{2(1+\beta_0)} K_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(w), \varphi(w))^{\beta-\beta_0} \, dV_\beta(w). \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

By the definition of the pull-back measure, the right hand side of (4.3) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} &CK_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{-(1+\beta)}\int_{\mathcal{U}}|K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,w)|^{2(1+\beta)}\left(\frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,w)K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)}{|K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,w)|^2}\right)^{\beta-\beta_0} dV_\beta(w) \\ &\geq CK_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{-(1+\beta)}\int_{B(z,\rho)}|K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,w)|^{2(1+\beta)}\left(\frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,w)K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)}{|K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,w)|^2}\right)^{\beta-\beta_0} dV_\beta(w). \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Since $w \in B(z,\rho)$, we have

$$\frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,w)K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)}{|K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,w)|^2} = \left|\frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,w)}{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,w)}\frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)}{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,w)}\right| \geq C_\rho^{-2}$$

by Theorem 2.1. Therefore, (4.4) is greater than or equal to

$$CK_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{-(1+\beta)}\int_{B(z,\rho)}|K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,w)|^{2(1+\beta)}\, dV_\beta(w) = CF_{\rho,\beta}(z).$$

Hence, (4.2) holds. □

4.2. **Criterion of compactness.** Let $p > 0$. We say that C_φ is compact on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ if the image under C_φ of any subset of $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ is a relatively compact subset. We see that C_φ is compact on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ if and only if

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\mathcal{U}}|C_\varphi f_k(w)|^p\, dV_\beta(w) = 0 \tag{4.5}$$

holds whenever $\{f_k\}$ is a bounded sequence in $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ that converges to 0 uniformly on each compact subset of $\mathcal{U}$ (for the case that $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{D}$, see [3, Proposition 3.1]). Since (4.5) is equivalent to

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\int_{\mathcal{U}}|f_k(w)|^p\, d\mu_{\varphi,\beta}(w) = 0,$$

C_φ is a compact operator on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ if and only if $\mu_{\varphi,\beta}$ is a vanishing Carleson measure for $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$. By Theorem 3.3, the property of being a vanishing Carleson measure is independent of p. Hence, the compactness of C_φ on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ is also independent of p. We note the characterlization of the compactness of C_φ on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\beta > \beta_{\min}$. Then, the following conditions are all equivalent.*
(i) C_φ *is a compact operator on* $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$.
(ii) $\mu_{\varphi,\beta}$ *is a vanishing Carleson measure for* $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$.
(iii) $\lim_{z\to\partial\mathcal{U}}\widetilde{\mu_{\varphi,\beta}}(z) = 0$.
(iv) $\lim_{z\to\partial\mathcal{U}}\widehat{\mu_{\varphi,\beta}}(z) = 0$.
(v) $\lim_{z\to\partial\mathcal{U}}F_{\rho,\beta}(z) = 0$.

Theorem 4.5. *If C_φ is a compact operator on $L^q_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$ for some $q > 0$ and $\beta_0 > \beta_{\min}$, then C_φ is a compact operator on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ for any $p > 0$ and $\beta \geq \beta_0$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.4, it is enough to prove

$$\lim_{z\to\partial\mathcal{U}}\widetilde{\mu_{\varphi,\beta_0}}(z) = 0 \Longrightarrow \lim_{z\to\partial\mathcal{U}}F_{\rho,\beta}(z) = 0.$$

This follows from (4.2). □

5. Some equalities

5.1. **Equality for a homogeneous Siegel domain.** In order to characterlize the compactness of the composition operators on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$, we use an integral formula on a homogeneous Siegel domain. First, we recall notation and properties of the homogeneous Siegel domains following [1] and [5]. Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a convex cone not containing any straight lines and $F : \mathbb{C}^m \times \mathbb{C}^m \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ a Hermitian form such that $F(u, u) \in \mathrm{Cl}(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}$, where $\mathrm{Cl}(\Omega)$ is the closure of Ω. Then, the Siegel domain $\mathcal{D}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ (\xi, \eta) \in \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^m \,\middle|\, \frac{\xi - \overline{\xi}}{2i} - F(\eta, \eta) \in \Omega \right\}.$$

It is known that every bounded homogeneous domain is holomorphically equivalent to a homogeneous Siegel domain [10].

Let l be the rank of Ω. For $1 \le j \le l$, let $n_j \ge 0, q_j \ge 0$ and $d_j \le 0$ be real numbers defined in [5] (These notations are also used in [1]. Note that d_j in [7] is $-d_j$ in the present notation). We write $\underline{n}$ by the vector of $\mathbb{R}^l$ whose components are n_j. The notations $\underline{q}$ and $\underline{d}$ are used similarly. By using compound power functions defined in [5, (2.3)], it is known that the Bergman kernel of $\mathcal{D}$ is given by

$$K_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta, \zeta') = C \left(\frac{\xi - \overline{\xi'}}{2i} - F(\eta, \eta') \right)^{2\underline{d} - \underline{q}} \qquad (\zeta = (\xi, \eta),\, \zeta' = (\xi', \eta'))$$

(see also [1, Proposition II.1]). For

$$\beta > \beta_{\min} := -\min \left\{ \frac{n_j + 2}{2(-2d_j + q_j)} \,\middle|\, 1 \le j \le l \right\}, \tag{5.1}$$

we consider the weighted Bergman space

$$L^p_a(\mathcal{D}, K_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta, \zeta)^{-\beta} dV(\zeta)) := L^p(\mathcal{D}, K_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta, \zeta)^{-\beta} dV(\zeta)) \cap \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{D}).$$

By [1, Theorem II.2], we see that $L^2_a(\mathcal{D}, K_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta, \zeta)^{-\beta} dV(\zeta)) \neq \{0\}$ if (5.1) holds. For

$$\beta_{\mathrm{int}} := \max \left\{ \frac{n_j}{2(-2d_j + q_j)} \,\middle|\, 1 \le j \le l \right\},$$

Békollé and Kagou showed the following integral formula.

Lemma 5.1 ([1, Corollary II.4]). *Let $\beta > \beta_{\min}$ and $\alpha > \beta + \beta_{\mathrm{int}}$. Then, one has*

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}} |K_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta, \zeta')|^{1+\alpha} K_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta', \zeta')^{-\beta} \, dV(\zeta') = C_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, \beta) K_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta, \zeta)^{\alpha - \beta}, \tag{5.2}$$

where $C_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha, \beta)$ is a positive function of α and β.

We shall obtain an equality of a minimal bounded homogeneous domain from Lemma 5.1.

5.2. **Equality for a minimal bounded homogeneous domain.** Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a Siegel domain biholomorphic to $\mathcal{U}$ and Φ a biholomorphic map from $\mathcal{U}$ onto $\mathcal{D}$. We have an isometry

$$L^2_a(\mathcal{D}, K_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta, \zeta)^{-\beta} dV(\zeta)) \ni f \longmapsto \det J(\Phi, \cdot)^{1+\beta} f \circ \Phi \in L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta).$$

In particular, $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta) \neq \{0\}$ for $\beta > \beta_{min}$.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\beta > \beta_{\min}$ and $\alpha > \beta + \beta_{\mathrm{int}}$. Then, one has*

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} |K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z')|^{1+\alpha} |\det J(\Phi,z')|^{1+2\beta-\alpha}\, dV_\beta(z') = C_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha,\beta) K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{\alpha-\beta} |\det J(\Phi,z)|^{1+2\beta-\alpha}$$

for any $z \in \mathcal{U}$.

Proof. Let $\zeta' = \Phi(z')$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} dV_\beta(z') &= K_{\mathcal{U}}(\Phi^{-1}(\zeta'),\Phi^{-1}(\zeta'))^{-\beta} \left|\det J(\Phi^{-1},\zeta')\right|^2 dV(\zeta') \\ &= \left|\det J(\Phi,\Phi^{-1}(\zeta'))\right|^{-2(1+\beta)} K_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta',\zeta')^{-\beta} dV(\zeta'), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\mathcal{U}} |K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z')|^{1+\alpha} |\det J(\Phi,z')|^{1+2\beta-\alpha}\, dV_\beta(z') \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{D}} \left|K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,\Phi^{-1}(\zeta'))\right|^{1+\alpha} \left|\det J(\Phi,\Phi^{-1}(\zeta'))\right|^{-(1+\alpha)} K_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta',\zeta')^{-\beta}\, dV(\zeta'). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

By transformation formula of the Bergman kernel, we have

$$K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,\Phi^{-1}(\zeta')) = K_{\mathcal{D}}(\Phi(z),\zeta') \det J(\Phi,z)\, \overline{\det J(\Phi,\Phi^{-1}(\zeta'))}.$$

Therefore, the right hand side of (5.3) is equal to

$$\int_{\mathcal{D}} |K_{\mathcal{D}}(\Phi(z),\zeta')|^{1+\alpha} |\det J(\Phi,z)|^{1+\alpha} K_{\mathcal{D}}(\zeta',\zeta')^{-\beta}\, dV(\zeta'). \tag{5.4}$$

By Lemma 5.1, (5.4) is equal to

$$C_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha,\beta) |\det J(\Phi,z)|^{1+2\beta-\alpha} K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{\alpha-\beta}.$$

□

Corollary 5.3. *Let $\beta > \beta_{\min}$ and $\alpha > \beta + \beta_{\mathrm{int}}$. For any $z \in \mathcal{U}$, the function*

$$g_z(w) := K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,z)^{\frac{1+\alpha}{2}} \det J(\Phi,w)^{\frac{1+2\beta-\alpha}{2}}$$

is in $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$. In particular, one has

$$\|g_z\|^2_{L^2(dV_\beta)} = C_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha,\beta) K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{\alpha-\beta} |\det J(\Phi,z)|^{1+2\beta-\alpha}.$$

Proof. We have

$$\|g_z\|^2_{L^2(dV_\beta)} = \int_{\mathcal{U}} |K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,w)|^{1+\alpha} |\det J(\Phi,w)|^{1+2\beta-\alpha}\, K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,w)^{-\beta} dV(w).$$

By Lemma 5.2, this is equal to $C_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha,\beta) K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{\alpha-\beta} |\det J(\Phi,z)|^{1+2\beta-\alpha}$. □

By using Corollary 5.3, we construct a positive function that satisfies the condition of Schur's Theorem (see [13, Theorem 3.6]) in section 6.2.

6. CHARACTERLIZATION OF THE COMPACTNESS OF COMPOSITION OPERATORS

6.1. **Proof of the characterization of the compactness.** By using the lemmas in section 6.2, we prove Theorem A.

Theorem 6.1. *If* C_φ *is bounded on* $L^q_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$*, then the following conditions are equivalent for* $\beta > \beta_0 + \beta_{\mathrm{int}}$.
(i) C_φ *is a compact operator on* $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$.
(ii) $\displaystyle\lim_{z\to\partial\mathcal{U}} \frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(z),\varphi(z))}{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)} = 0.$

Proof. It is enough to prove $p = q = 2$. First, we prove that (i) implies (ii). Assume that C_φ is a compact operator on $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$. Then, C^*_φ is also compact. Since $\{k^{(\beta)}_z\}$ converges to 0 uniformly on compact subsets of $\mathcal{U}$ as $z \to \partial\mathcal{U}$, we have $\|C^*_\varphi k^{(\beta)}_z\|_{L^2(dV_\beta)} \to 0$ as $z \to \partial\mathcal{U}$. From (4.1), we obtain (ii).

Next, we prove that (ii) implies (i). For $f \in L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$, let

$$Sf(z) := \int_{\mathcal{U}} K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(z), \varphi(w))\, f(w)\, dV_\beta(w).$$

Since C_φ is a bounded operator on $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$, we have $C_\varphi C^*_\varphi = S$ by (2.9). Therefore the compactness of C_φ is equivalent to the compactness of S. Hence, it is sufficient to prove that S^+ is a compact operator on $L^2(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$, where

$$S^+ f(z) := \int_{\mathcal{U}} \left| K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(z), \varphi(w)) \right| f(w)\, dV_\beta(w)$$

for $f \in L^2(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$. For $r > 0$, let $\mathcal{U}_r := \{z \in \mathcal{U} \mid \mathrm{dist}(z, \partial\mathcal{U}) < r\}$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} K^+_{1,r}(z,w) &:= \chi_{\mathcal{U}\setminus\mathcal{U}_r}(w) \left| K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(z), \varphi(w)) \right|, \\ K^+_{2,r}(z,w) &:= \chi_{\mathcal{U}\setminus\mathcal{U}_r}(z)\, \chi_{\mathcal{U}_r}(w) \left| K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(z), \varphi(w)) \right|, \\ K^+_{3,r}(z,w) &:= \chi_{\mathcal{U}_r}(z)\, \chi_{\mathcal{U}_r}(w) \left| K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(z), \varphi(w)) \right|, \end{aligned}$$

and $S^+_{j,r}$ by integral operators on $L^2(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ with kernel $K^+_{j,r}$. Then, we have

$$S^+ = S^+_{1,r} + S^+_{2,r} + S^+_{3,r}.$$

We will prove that $S^+_{1,r}$ and $S^+_{2,r}$ are compact operators on $L^2(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ for any $r > 0$ and $\left\|S^+_{3,r}\right\| \to 0$ as $r \to 0$ in section 6.2. Using these results, we see that S^+ is a compact operator on $L^2(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$. □

6.2. **Some Lemmas.** In this subsection, we show some properties of the operators defined in the proof of Theorem 6.1. Since we assumed that C_φ is bounded on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 6.2. *The operators* $S^+_{1,r}$ *and* $S^+_{2,r}$ *are compact on* $L^2(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$.

Proof. It is enough to prove $K^+_{1,r}$ and $K^+_{2,r}$ are in $L^2(\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta \times dV_\beta)$ (for example, see [13, Theorem 3.5]). For $w \in \mathcal{U}$, let

$$K^{(\beta)}_{\varphi(w)}(z) := K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}(z, \varphi(w)).$$

Then, $K^{(\beta)}_{\varphi(w)} \in L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|K^+_{1,r}\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{U})} &= \int_{\mathcal{U}\setminus\mathcal{U}_r} \left\{\int_{\mathcal{U}} \left|K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}\left(\varphi(z),\varphi(w)\right)\right|^2 dV_\beta(z)\right\} dV_\beta(w) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{U}\setminus\mathcal{U}_r} \left\|C_\varphi K^{(\beta)}_{\varphi(w)}\right\|^2_{L^2(dV_\beta)} dV_\beta(w). \qquad (6.1)\end{aligned}$$

Since C_φ is a bounded operator on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$, C_φ is bounded on $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ by Theorem 4.3. Hence, we have

$$\left\|C_\varphi K^{(\beta)}_{\varphi(w)}\right\|^2_{L^2(dV_\beta)} \leq C \left\|K^{(\beta)}_{\varphi(w)}\right\|^2_{L^2(dV_\beta)} = C K^{(\beta)}_{\mathcal{U}}\left(\varphi(w),\varphi(w)\right) \leq C K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,w)^{1+\beta}, \qquad (6.2)$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 4.2. Substituting (6.2) to (6.1), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|K^+_{1,r}\right\|^2_{L^2(\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{U})} &\leq C \int_{\mathcal{U}\setminus\mathcal{U}_r} K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,w)^{1+\beta}\, dV_\beta(w) \\ &= C \int_{\mathcal{U}\setminus\mathcal{U}_r} K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,w)\, dV(w) \\ &< \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have $\left\|K^+_{2,r}\right\|_{L^2(\mathcal{U}\times\mathcal{U})} < \infty$. □

Assume that $\beta > \beta_0 + \beta_{\mathrm{int}}$ and C_φ is a bounded operator on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$. Then, we obtain Lemma 6.3, which plays an impotant role in the proof of Theorem 6.1. The assumption $\beta > \beta_0 + \beta_{\mathrm{int}}$ is only used to prove Lemma 6.3.

Lemma 6.3. *For $z \in \mathcal{U}$, let*

$$h(z) := K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)^{\beta-\beta_0} \left|\det J(\Phi, \varphi(z))\right|^{1+2\beta_0-\beta}.$$

Then, one has

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} K^+_{3,r}(z,w) h(w)\, dV_\beta(w) \leq C\, \chi_{\mathcal{U}_r}(z) \left(\frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}\left(\varphi(z),\varphi(z)\right)}{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)}\right)^{\beta-\beta_0} h(z). \qquad (6.3)$$

Proof. For $z \in \mathcal{U}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathcal{U}} K^+_{3,r}(z,w) h(w)\, dV_\beta(w) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{U}} \chi_{\mathcal{U}_r}(z)\, \chi_{\mathcal{U}_r}(w) \left|K_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(z),\varphi(w))\right|^{1+\beta} \det J(\Phi,\varphi(w))^{1+2\beta_0-\beta}\, dV_{\beta_0}(w). \qquad (6.4)\end{aligned}$$

Here, we define a holomorphic function g_z by

$$g_z(w) := \left\{K_{\mathcal{U}}(w,\varphi(z))^{1+\beta} \det J(\Phi,w)^{1+2\beta_0-\beta}\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then, the right hand side of (6.4) is equal to

$$\chi_{\mathcal{U}_r}(z) \int_{\mathcal{U}_r} \left|g_z(\varphi(w))\right|^2 dV_{\beta_0}(w) \leq \chi_{\mathcal{U}_r}(z) \int_{\mathcal{U}} \left|C_\varphi g_z(w)\right|^2 dV_{\beta_0}(w). \qquad (6.5)$$

Since $\beta_0 > \beta_{\min}$ and $\beta > \beta_0 + \beta_{\mathrm{int}}$, the function g_z is in $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$ by Corollary 5.3. Moreover, since C_φ is a bounded operator on $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$ by assumption, C_φ is bounded on $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$ by Theorem 4.3. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{U}} K^+_{3,r}(z,w)h(w)\,dV_\beta(w) &\le \chi_{\mathcal{U}_r}(z)\left\|C_\varphi g_z\right\|^2_{L^2(dV_{\beta_0})}\\ &\le C\chi_{\mathcal{U}_r}(z)\left\|g_z\right\|^2_{L^2(dV_{\beta_0})}. \qquad (6.6)\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\left\|g_z\right\|^2_{L^2(dV_{\beta_0})} = K_{\mathcal{U}}(\varphi(z),\varphi(z))^{\beta-\beta_0}\det J(\Phi,\varphi(z))^{1+2\beta_0-\beta} \qquad (6.7)$$

by Corollary 5.3. Substituting (6.7) to (6.6), we obtain (6.3). □

As we have already noted, the following lemma completes the proof of Theorem 6.1.

Lemma 6.4. *One has* $\left\|S^+_{3,r}\right\| \to 0$ *as* $r \to 0$.

Proof. Put

$$M(r) := \sup_{z\in\mathcal{U}_r}\left\{\frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}\left(\varphi(z),\varphi(z)\right)}{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z,z)}\right\}^{\beta-\beta_0}.$$

By Lemma 6.3, we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}} K^+_{3,r}(z,w)h(w)\,dV_\beta(w) \le C\,M(r)h(z).$$

By using Schur's Theorem, $S^+_{3,r}$ is a bounded operator on $L^2_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ with norm not exceeding $CM(r)$. By (ii) of Theorem 6.1, we obtain $M(r) \to 0$ as $r \to 0$. Hence we have $\left\|S^+_{3,r}\right\| \to 0$ as $r \to 0$. □

7. Examples

We apply Theorem A for some examples.

7.1. **The unit ball.** Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the unit ball $\mathbb{B}^d$. Then, we have $l = 1$ and $n_1 = 0, d_1 = -1, q_1 = d-1$. Hence, we have $\beta_{\min} = -\frac{1}{d+1}$ and $\beta_{\mathrm{int}} = 0$. Therefore, we obtain the following;

Corollary 7.1 ([14, Theorem 4.1])**.** *Suppose* $\beta > -\frac{1}{d+1}$. *If the composition operator* C_φ *is bounded on* $L^q_a(\mathbb{B}^d, dV_{\beta_0})$ *for some* $-\frac{1}{d+1} < \beta_0 < \beta$, *then* C_φ *is compact on* $L^p_a(\mathbb{B}^d, dV_\beta)$ *if and only if*

$$\lim_{z\to\partial\mathbb{B}^d}\frac{K_{\mathbb{B}^d}\left(\varphi(z),\varphi(z)\right)}{K_{\mathbb{B}^d}(z,z)} = 0.$$

7.2. **The Harish-Chandra realization of irreducible bounded symmetric domain.** Let Ω be an irreducible bounded symmetric domain in its Harish-Chandra realization, r the rank of Ω and a, b nonnegative integers defined in [8]. Then, we see that $l = r$ and $n_j = a(r-j), d_j = -1 - \frac{a(r-1)}{2}, q_j = b$ for $1 \le j \le r$. Hence, we obtain $\beta_{\min} = -\frac{1}{N}$ and $\beta_{\mathrm{int}} = \frac{a(r-1)}{2N}$, where $N := q_j - 2d_j = a(r-1) + b + 2$ is the genus of Ω.

Corollary 7.2 ([8, Theorem]). *Suppose* $\beta_0 > -\frac{1}{N}$. *If the composition operator* C_φ *is bounded on* $L^q_a(\Omega, dV_{\beta_0})$ *for some* $q > 0$ *and* $\beta_0 + \frac{a(r-1)}{2N} < \beta$, *then* C_φ *is compact on* $L^p_a(\Omega, dV_\beta)$ *if and only if*

$$\lim_{z \to \partial\Omega} \frac{K_\Omega\left(\varphi(z), \varphi(z)\right)}{K_\Omega(z, z)} = 0.$$

7.3. **The polydisk.** Let $\mathcal{U}$ be the polydisk $\mathbb{D}^m := \mathbb{D} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{D}$. Then, we have $l = m$ and $n_j = 0, d_j = -1, q_j = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Hence, we have $\beta_{\min} = -\frac{1}{2}$ and $\beta_{\text{int}} = 0$.

Corollary 7.3. *Suppose* $\beta > -\frac{1}{2}$. *If the composition operator* C_φ *is bounded on* $L^q_a(\mathbb{D}^m, dV_{\beta_0})$ *for some* $-\frac{1}{2} < \beta_0 < \beta$, *then* C_φ *is compact on* $L^p_a(\mathbb{D}^m, dV_\beta)$ *if and only if*

$$\lim_{z \to \partial\mathbb{D}^m} \frac{K_{\mathbb{D}^m}\left(\varphi(z), \varphi(z)\right)}{K_{\mathbb{D}^m}(z, z)} = 0.$$

7.4. **A nonsymmetric minimal homogeneous domain.** Let T_Ω be the tube domain over Vinberg cone. It is known that T_Ω is a nonsymmetric homogeneous domain (see [2]). By [6, Proposition 3.8], the representative domain $\mathcal{U}$ of T_Ω is a nonsymmetric minimal bounded homogeneous domain with a center 0. In this case, we have $l = 3$ and $\underline{n} = (2, 0, 0), \underline{d} = (-2, -\frac{3}{2}, -\frac{3}{2}), \underline{q} = (0, 0, 0)$. Hence, we have $\beta_{\min} = -\frac{1}{3}$ and $\beta_{\text{int}} = \frac{1}{4}$.

Corollary 7.4. *Suppose* $\beta_0 > -\frac{1}{3}$ *and the composition operator* C_φ *is bounded on* $L^q_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_{\beta_0})$. *For* $\beta > \beta_0 + \frac{1}{4}$, C_φ *is compact on* $L^p_a(\mathcal{U}, dV_\beta)$ *if and only if*

$$\lim_{z \to \partial\mathcal{U}} \frac{K_{\mathcal{U}}\left(\varphi(z), \varphi(z)\right)}{K_{\mathcal{U}}(z, z)} = 0.$$

Acknowledgment. The author would like to express my gratitude to Professor H. Ishi for advices and suggestions. The author would also like to thank to Professor T. Ohsawa for helpful discussions.

References

[1] D. Békollé, A. T. Kagou, *Reproducing properties and L^p-estimates for Bergman projections in Siegel domains of type II.*, Studia. Math. **115**, (1995), 219–239.

[2] D. Békollé, C. Nana, *L^p-boundedness of Bergman projections in the tube domain over Vinberg's cone*, J. Lie Theory, **17**, (2007), 115–144.

[3] C. Cowen, B. MacCluer, *Composition operators on spaces of analytic function*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1994.

[4] M. Engliš, *Compact Toeplitz operators via the Berezin transform on bounded symmetric domains*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory, **20**, (1999), 426–455.

[5] S. G. Gindikin, *Analysis in homogeneous domains*, Russian Math. Surveys **19-4**, (1964), 1–89.

[6] H. Ishi, C. Kai, *The representative domain of a homogeneous bounded domain*, Kyushu J. Math. **64**, (2010), 35–47.

[7] H. Ishi, S. Yamaji, *Some estimates of the Bergman kernel of minimal bounded homogeneous domains*, J. Lie Theory, **21** (2011), 755–769.

[8] X. Lu, Z. Hu, *Compact composition operators on weighted Bergman spaces on bounded symmetric domains*, Acta Math. Scientia, **31B**(2), (2011), 468–476.

[9] M. Maschler, *Minimal domains and their Bergman kernel function*, Pacific J. Math. **6**, (1956), 501–516.

[10] È. B. Vinberg, S. G. Gindikin, I. I. Pjateckiĭ-Šapiro, *Classification and canonical realization of complex bounded homogeneous domains*, Trans. Moscow Math. Soc. **12**, (1963) 404–437.

[11] S. Yamaji, *Positive Toeplitz operators on the Bergman space of a minimal bounded homogeneous domain*, to appear in Hokkaido Math. J.

[12] K. H. Zhu, *Positive Toeplitz operators on weighted Bergman spaces of bounded symmetric domains*, J. Oper. Theory, **20**, (1988), 329–357.
[13] K. H. Zhu, *Operator theory in function spaces, second edition*, Amer. Math. Soc., Mathematical Surveys and Monographs Vol.**138**, 2007.
[14] K. H. Zhu, *Compact composition operators on weighted Bergman spaces of the unit ball*, Houston J. Math., **33**, (2007), 273–283.

Satoshi Yamaji
Graduate School of Mathematics
Nagoya University
Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, 464-8602
Japan
E-mail address: `satoshi.yamaji@math.nagoya-u.ac.jp`